SINGAPORE - Joint Meeting of the ICANN Board and the At-Large
Tuesday, February 10, 2015 – 08:30 to 09:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: Ladies and gentlemen, can you take your seats, please. Thank you very much. I'd like to welcome everyone to the ALAC board meeting. This is our traditional slot, which is first on the agenda, we believe.

To make sure everyone on the ALAC was awake, we decided to meet with the ccNSO at 7:00, but it's been an interesting day so far.

A couple of just notes.

We've been using a two-minute timer for much of our -- the first couple of days, to try to make sure that we keep the meeting moving, nobody has too much of an opportunity to give speeches, and we have perhaps an opportunity for all or at least most of the items on the agenda.

So we're going to try it. We'll see how it works. I'm told staff is trying to get one up but we're not sure we can right now. But nevertheless...

Can we have the first slide, please.

All right. We have four items on our agenda.

The first one, and perhaps the most important one, are these meetings themselves. And we'd like to see if we can, from both the ALAC and the board perspective, make these meetings more effective and really come away from them believing that we've accomplished something, which has not always been the case.

EN

The second one is, as every -- well, some people don't know. In response to the advice to freeze certain categories of gTLDs in Los Angeles, advice to the board from the ALAC, one of the outcomes was something that from our perspective has never happened before.

We had a request from the new gTLD process committee to have a subset of the committee talk to a subset of the ALAC, and specifically the people who were most involved in the process.

This concept of actually talking to each other is interesting, and I'd like to explore it a little bit more, and perhaps as a first -- as a model.

The third item is the substance of that discussion -- of what that discussion was and the advice and the follow-on meeting that was held last night, and we'll talk a little bit about that one.

And lastly, we'll spend a few minutes at the end looking at a select number of the recommendations that came out of the at-large summit and give an update on where we are.

And if we could have the next slide and we'll start.

Thank you.

The questions that are on the slide, I think, say it all.

Certainly from a perspective of at-large and ALAC members, we've often found these meetings less than satisfactory. They're an opportunity -- I'll be very blunt -- an opportunity to speak and often be misunderstood in both directions, and they're not -- they have not been a very productive way of really moving forward on issues that are hopefully important to both of us, and I'd like to -- I guess I'm asking the question:

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Is -- how do other people feel about if? If it's just me, then we'll continue doing exactly what we're doing. But if there's any perspective from the board and certainly from other ALAC members that we can do better and use this time more effectively, I guess I'd like an interesting discussion on this. Steve?

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you, Alan. So first of all, let me say on behalf of the board, welcome, and we're pleased to be here.

But moving quickly into the point that you've raised, Alan, we too have a sense that these encounters are not as effective as they could be or should be.

My standard spiel has always been on these that we want to use this time to get involved in very direct and candid discussion and get into substance.

A few years ago, we used to have lunchtime engagements or breakfast meetings or whatever, and we shifted to this mode in order to be more businesslike and more substantive.

We've been hearing -- and our own sense of things also matches -- that this has not been quite as effective as it should be. So both with respect to the direct discussion about how can we engage with ALAC in a better way and how can we use the constituency day or should we be using it, is all open for discussion.

So we're keenly involved. So it's not just Alan, for sure.

That's only the -- half of what needs to be said.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

We know we need to change. We don't know what we need to change to, and so now let's do have suggestions and maybe we can find some positive ways forward.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Steve. I open the floor to anyone else.

Go ahead, Ray.

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Alan.

One of the things that hampers discussion is people don't have time to prepare for it.

The board used to, at one point in time, attempt to provide some agenda items, and then for what I'll call it being too hard, we stopped doing that and we just said, "We came here to listen and interact."

The -- so the agendas have always been produced by you guys, and most of the time the ALAC has got agendas to us a little bit ahead of time so we could have chances to look at it and stuff like that.

But if you want to have meaningful discussions, people have to understand what it is you're going to talk about, instead of walking cold into the room, although sometimes that works real well.

And the one thing I've always liked about the meetings with the ALAC is it is the first thing in the morning, everybody is awake -- or should be -- but a lot of psychologists have noted that your most productive time is

in the morning when your mind is not cluttered with a bunch of other stuff, you know.

There are other people that meet with us on Tuesday later in the day that complain about the fact that the board is cranky, you know. And yes, quite frankly, we are.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Speak for yourself.

RAY PLZAK: Well, Chris is cranky all the time.

So their -- so the idea is -- and the discussions that we do have, I over time have found that they have been useful. It's probably missing some focus that we might want to have is where I think we should go, and whether or not we want that focus to be directed to what's the big points of the meeting is another thing.

You know, because there's going to be a -- for example, pick your subject. Whatever it is at whatever meeting, there's something that's always important, and it's going to be discussed in numerous fora, and then what happens is that you get the same discussion with the board here, and the result of that is that you don't get to talk about other salient points, like what we're talking about right now.

So I applaud you for not having those other buzzwords on there, and it gives us a chance to talk about some real meaningful things between us. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Ray. I will certainly mention that there was significant pressure to put accountability and transition on there because it's so important we have to talk to the board about it. We resisted.

RAY PLZAK: And I applaud your leadership courage.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anybody else? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Alan.

I just wanted to bring attention to at least my own perception that when things work at their best, they're topic-based, as opposed to dog-and-pony show, roadshow kind of thing, where you come in and, "Okay, what do you want," and then "what do you want?"

I find that both within the board and within ALAC and within just about every constituency, you have people that have real passionate interests about particular things, and then when you have this kind of cross-pollination -- we've had it on the PICs. For instance, Chris' participation in the accountability group. He's been making really good contributions in that. And so when you have this kind of thing where you've got board people that are sort of interspersed through the topic-based material, as opposed to this constituency and this constituency, I find it works at its best when you do it -- when it's done topic-based, as

opposed to just, you know, throw the constituencies together one at a time. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Evan.

The issue of board members getting involved in other activities, I really would like to postpone to a later discussion, but yes, certainly what you're saying is true.

Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Alan. Thanks, Evan. I think it -- well, I'm happy to have a discussion about us getting involved later but I think it goes to the key today, or do we think -- you know, the way today is structured.

The issue -- another way to do today would be to have the whole day dealing with individual issues, but the problem with that is that you wouldn't be able to meet because you'd be running around dealing with all sorts of different issues, so that's not workable.

Another alternative would be that -- and we had started to talk about this -- would be that we, the board, splits up and comes to -- spends the whole day with the ALAC, two or three board members, two or three board members with the CCs, and with some kind of principles in mind which would be, unless -- for example, from the CC world, unless there is a very specific topic that Mike or I need to be at, we wouldn't go to the CCs. We'd go somewhere else.

And that -- there's a discipline involved in that. And what we -- the sorts of things we've sort of talking about is that would be quite interesting because then at the end of that day, the board members that were just, say, with the ALAC all day could -- at the end could say "Here's what we heard today, this is what we're going to tell the board," and then when we gather on Wednesday, we could do a quick round-the-table -- if it's possible on the board to do anything quickly around the table -- you know, five minutes from each of those.

So that's just an idea, but let's, you know, maybe talk about that sort of change for Tuesday and see whether it's workable.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Chris. I must admit when we wrote this subject, we were not really talking about changing the overall structure of the process, but if we're going to meet for an hour, how do we make that time more effective.

The concept of board members going around to the other groups is, of course, what we did before we started this, although not for the whole day.

It strikes me if you try to spend a whole day with specific groups, or a half day, you probably, in a lot of cases, have a fair amount of time to work on email because not everything that we would be doing on the only day we have for real work is going to be riveting.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: No, but it's about -- but isn't it about community and about learning and about watching the way that people work?

It's not necessarily just about discussing a topic. It's actually about getting into the -- each of the SOs and ACs as a board member and getting that into your -- into your DNA as that this is how they work.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you.

I have Cheryl next and then Ray again.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record.

Providing that doing that is clearly framed and the communities you're going to understand that, I believe that will work, but back in the dim, dark, distant days of the dog-and-pony show that we used to have, it was very much, "And a report card will be going back to the board about what the ALAC is or isn't doing."

Now, that's what we need to avoid, if I think a more productive way of inserting yourselves into the activities of constituency day is to happen.

I think it's a model. I think it's well worthwhile exploring. But I think the communities that you're going to need to understand: And then what happens?   Is this a judgment call or are you specifically looking to integrate, reach out, and understand?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cheryl.

                      Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Alan.

                     Yeah, I often have thought what Chris is talking about -- in fact, I'd
                     proposed an idea similar to that too in the past -- is actually the way to
                     go.

                     You know, you want to communicate with the board. That doesn't
                     mean you have to communicate with every board member. And if the
                     community wants to treat the board as an immature soccer team where
                     everybody chases the ball, the board is not going to be effective.

                     And if you give the board the opportunity to send a -- what amounts to
                     a small delegation, not there to write a report card but to actually
                     interact and talk about things and give you a sense of what the board is
                     thinking at the time and take away important points and bring them
                     back, and then the board can convene amongst themselves and
                     exchange all these ideas and -- certainly you would see, at some point in
                     time, in exchange of those ideas there may be some common threads
                     which really need to be brought to a larger forum.

                     So there's a lot to be said for that.

                     And so as long as different groups within the community don't see the
                     need or can understand that they don't need to talk -- to have every
                     board member present to make your point, I think it's well served.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much.

I -- from my perspective, I see the ideas evolving as we're going along. Having a few board members there who are willing -- who can speak not on behalf of the board but with the tone of the board, and interactions, I think would be far better than having them in the back of the room watching what else is going on for the rest of the day. At that point, we'd probably be structuring our agenda to impress the board, as opposed to doing our work, but I like the way part of this is going.

Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: I was just going to say, it depends what you want to achieve from these meetings.

If it's about talking about two or three issues that you want to debate and really have some good dialogue, then I suggest personally that you need a bigger number from the board because you have different expertise and different knowledge and not everybody can answer everything. If it's just about getting -- another objective, which is getting the feel for where the board is going and some interaction, then that other model.

So I think you need to decide what do you want from those meetings, because it doesn't work both ways. You have to decide the objective, and then depending on the objective of the meeting, you'll decide on the format.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cherine.

Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking.

In light of what Chris has said and of what Cherine has mentioned, I know that there's also likely to be changes with regards to the meeting strategy, with longer meetings and shorter meetings throughout the year.

Chris went on a -- a set of suggestions for interactions: Smaller groups of board members spending the whole day. Is this something that is on the card or just up for discussion, and is this something perhaps we could experiment with in future meetings?

And perhaps not just doing one or the other. We might have a 45-minute meeting with the whole board, but then a few handful of board members joining for the rest of the day.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: So it's a topic for discussion. The only thing I want to say is just a slight caution, which is that -- because often these things have a tendency to go out there and start running, "The board is about to change everything," blah, blah, blah.

So that's not the case. It's -- and it's an interesting idea that we would actually still have the face-to-face meeting and whatever, but the --

again, it's a function of how do we -- how do you fit it all into sensible timing so that it works.

And I don't think I'm -- I'm talking out of school to say that the board currently is, you know, concerned about the amount of stuff that's going on -- not just the workload, but stuff that's going on -- and we need to try and fix that.

So it will be a little while before you see -- but we want to talk to everybody about it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Anyone else want to weigh in on this? We have four topics, and we are about a quarter of the way into the meeting.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: (off microphone).

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry, Siva, go ahead.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Before longer implements like a whole-day meeting or interaction of some board members with ALAC longer for longer time has taken up, there are certain practical instruments that could be implemented such as having at least one phone call with the board before every ICANN meeting. And if there is some way by which we could do it, we could open an email channel with some members of the board with ALAC executive committee so there is some constant exchange of ideas. And

to improve actual board interaction in ICANN meetings, I would suggest that we at least have a lunch with the board. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Siva. Anyone else want to weigh in on this?

Then we go on to the next topic. Slide, please.

We are skipping over these a little bit too fast. Somehow these slides have gotten out of order. I'm not quite sure how.

Let's go back to the main agenda item. Okay.

The next item is essentially this discussion but changed from what do we do at ICANN meetings to how do we have interactions with the board when it would appear that we can benefit from actually talking to each other as opposed to submitting advice or getting formal responses. The example or the case we had with the advice on the PICs, that is, the advice to freeze gTLDs -- and I think we've been honest enough to say we use strong words to get people's attention, and I think we succeeded ultimately.

But what we have ended up with is an example of since L.A., we have had one teleconference, a small number of people, a manageable number of people, and then last night there was a face-to-face meeting and I'll be talking about that again in a minute. But, nevertheless, I think it illustrates that both certainly from the ALAC side and from the board side there seems to be a realization that dialogue can be a more effective way of moving forward than just exchanging documents.

And I guess I would like a little bit of discussion both from the ALAC and the board on: Is this possible and practical other than, you know, when we throw down the gauntlet and say, Do something completely radical and you have to react to that one. I find it's a model which is particularly useful that we may be able to use other places. And I guess I would like a little bit of feedback. And my hat off to Cherine for initiating this one because I think it's useful in the particular topic, but I think it sets a model which we may want to use going forward.

Any thoughts? Evan?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Alan. There's actually a precedent from before this. And that's when, Tijani, you remember, we were working on the applicant support. This was something that had just about every community that was involved in the issue except for the board. We had GAC there. We had GNSO there. We had ALAC there. We got an incredible amount of work done. We probably could have worked even a little bit faster and a little bit better had there been a couple of people from the board that were involved in that. I simply bring this up because the concept of small, nimble -- relatively small and nimble subject-based cross-community groups have worked very, very effectively for us. They did on applicant support. I think they're doing it well now with PICs, and I would really like to see a heightened use of this in the future. It brings together the people that are skilled in this, you know, and being small and nimble it makes it a lot easier to work with it than some of these, you know, large things where we spend half the time at each meeting re-introducing the issue to each other. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Evan. Cherine?

CHERINE CHALABY: I think it's certainly very desirable the type of interaction we've had in
                             the last couple of days or couple of weeks. When there is an issue that
                             is difficult and complex and needs to be dealt with, emails and calls
                             don't work as well as face-to-face. And I have to say also that the board
                             or the NGPC are probably the least important in this. I mean, our role is
                             to act as a facilitator and bring together different parts of the
                             community like yesterday, for example, and the fact that you are able to
                             talk to the registries and the registrars and the GAC and also the
                             business constituency. That was very, very useful. I mean, it was a rich
                             conversation. Everybody was trying to understand the other person.

                             And that to me was very beneficial.

                             How often can you do this? I don't know. It's really logistic. But it's
                             definitely very desirable and very productive.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Cherine. Rinalia?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. I know this issue is constantly on the ALAC's mind. It was
                             posed to me at the last ALT meeting last Friday. It is posed here, and it
                             has been posed before in our interaction. My response to that is the
                             same as the first time it was addressed to me in Los Angeles. I actually

ICANN | 52
Singapore

think that focus on issues, focus on difficult, complex issues that require a lot of creative thinking and dialogue to figure out what the solution options are and then the NGPC can take steps to facilitate the parties coming together. That would be -- so the small groups discussion, if it is focused on that, it will be very effective.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Rinalia. Anybody else would like to weigh in on this?

Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, thank you. Just to say that the work done by the meeting strategy working group, it is exactly to try to help those issues to be tackled by the right group at the right moment.   And the fact that it will be organized to allow more interaction between the silos in one specific time during each meeting hopefully will help to sort that out. Here we have to do ad hoc exchanges. If it is embedded in the construction of the meeting, I hope it will be easier. I don't say it will be easy but easier. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Sebastien.

Ray?

RAY PLZAK: Thank you, Alan.   It is very important for people to get together to discuss specific issues. I mean, most of the significant work at ICANN is

probably done at a bar with a cocktail napkin. Seems true of the IETF and a few other places I have been to.

The other point is we have to be careful that we don't all of a sudden create an overload of a small-issue discussions so that people are bouncing back and forth between them. So at some point in time, there's going to have to be some discussion about doing some prioritization as far as making sure which ones are the ones that need to be dealt with sooner than others because if you don't do that, you'll end up with another cause for concern about burnout and overload.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Ray.

Anybody else? Evan, did I see your hand up again?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I was just going to address Ray's comment. How would you like to receive that prioritization? It took an ALAC call for a freeze -- which we will talk about in the next item, it took a drastic action to make sure that something was identified as a priority. If there is an easier way to put on the board's radar those few minor but really critical things we need to talk about, if there is an expressway for us to get that information to you, which those are, I'd love to know it.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ray has a quick answer.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

RAY PLZAK: Yes. I'd like to hear your suggestions.

                         [Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: Noted. I think the main suggestion is we're saying we really appreciate the opportunity to actually talk with people as opposed to talk at people. And we have an example it can work. Let's try not to forget it the next time something comes up.

                         Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier Crepin-LeBlond speaking. I think one of the improvements in speaking with each other rather than speaking at each other has to do with some of the informal gatherings that we've had. Ray mentioned the bar, but there's also some social events that take place between the board and various communities. I know we've had lunches in the past as well as cocktails. And that actually gets to have people meet in a more informal setting. Certainly get to understand some of the cultural differences between the different people that make up the board and different people that make up the ALAC and sometimes the different ways in which people deliver the message that they have to deliver. So that really helps.

ALAN GREENBERG: Anybody else? Cheryl? No? I don't see any other hands unless I'm missing one. We're going to go on to the next topic. We're actually on time.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Steve has added another topic, which we'll cover after this one. And just to make sure Ray can't prepare, we won't tell you what it is ahead of time.

RAY PLZAK: I already know.

[Laughter]

ALAN GREENBERG: The next one is -- I won't say substantive but a targeted discussion on the issue that we've been talking about of what was used as the pilot. I'll call it a pilot on the assumption that they will continue. And that is the ALAC request for a freeze on the GAC Category 1 TLDs that were subject to Safeguards 1 to 8 and contractual compliance. Now, we are in a rather awkward position. The meeting ran from 9:00 till about 11:30 last night, and we have not had any opportunity to brief the ALAC as to what happened. So they'll get a partial briefing as we're talking here.

The original meeting that we had was a small number of people from At-Large with a small number of people from the new gTLD process committee.

The meeting last night which Fadi convened was a somewhat larger group. There were more new gTLD board members at that meeting. It included the representatives from the various parts of the GNSO and the GNSO chair as well as a number -- the chair of the GAC and a

number of GAC members, all of whom who have some specific interest, either personal or business, in the discussion.

I think I can't say enough positive about the fact that the meeting happened. Again, this form of discussion, I think, is the only way we're going to reach closure on some of these really difficult issues. I will say that I disagree with Cherine just a bit. I think there was a lot more talking at people in both directions than there was real dialogue. And maybe that's just a matter of there's no real other choice the first time you meet in that kind of venue. But I certainly felt it could have been better, but I'm not sure how one could have orchestrated it to be better in that form. So it's certainly not meant as a criticism.

I don't know how -- it's something like the discussions that are going on in the IANA transition that we have people going in with different positions and everyone feeling if you say -- if you make your case enough times, the other people will decide that you're right. And it doesn't usually work quite that easily.

But I guess I would like some thoughts from the other people who were at that meeting in particular, and I may well be unique. And what can we do better in terms of doing this again in some future time?

And I apologize that only a few people were at the meeting and the rest of you can't really comment on what happened. We will -- within ALAC, in any case, we will have a more substantive discussion on that. And I presume there will be one at the board as well.

Any other thoughts?

I didn't see you there. Welcome, Fadi.

CHERINE CHALABY: This meeting was kind of organized at very short notice around a very critical issue. And I think you're right. This was the first meeting of that group of people coming together. And there were a lot of polarized positions before getting into the meeting. And the key here was everybody wanted to be heard rather than begin to understand. So I think you're right, the meeting began with a very polarized position, naturally.

And then I think towards the end, there was more of a dialogue when some ideas will began to emerge and be put on the table. As.

We said, we didn't expect much from this meeting other than to just get together and talk. And if there was one successful meeting, it was an agreement to meet again. In fact, we agreed to meet again. So it wasn't a decision-making meeting.

So I don't want to be judgmental about the meeting itself. But the fact that it was such a difficult issue with such a polarized position, bringing people together. And the meeting didn't descend into chaos but ended up at least people saying let's meet again in itself, I think, was a productive meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Fadi -- the list we have is Fadi, Mike, and George and Evan.

FADI CHEHADE: First of all, I want to thank the ALAC leadership for readily coming and joining this meeting. My commitment to you with Cherine is that when

ICANN | 52
Singapore

there are issues like this that affect the NGPC -- and he is the chair of the NGPC -- is that we will create spaces to reduce the distance between us. That's what we did last night. We just created a space where people can start reducing the distance between the parties.

And I think that goes in steps, Alan. I think step one was to hear each other across the table with a lot of wine in between. And that's a good thing. You know, at least people sat and had -- remember, where else does this happen? We had governments there. We had ALAC. So the GAC and ALAC and the business guys and the NGPC and the leaders of ICANN all sitting and just listening to each other, reducing the distance between us before the issues become charged and positions are taken that are intractable, we're trying to have a dialogue.

Now, we're late on this one a little bit. I hope that we don't do this again. When there are issues that are burning ALAC or GAC or others, instead of just talking at each other in very formal ways, let's quickly -- ICANN's responsibility is to create the space to reduce the distance between you and resolve issues in a substantive way.

On the Category 1 issue, I thought ALAC's -- Olivier, Alan, and Evan, I think that's the three of you who were there last night, presented your concerns and your positions with great eloquence and clarity. And, frankly, it was good for all the other sides to hear them.

And guess what? We're not -- the ALAC and GAC have different interests as well. It became clear last night that it is not like both of you are exactly in the same place. And that's good. That's okay to understand that so we can address different things. I want to thank Alan for his leadership and Olivier and Evan for their great work. And

this is the beginning, as you know. But Cherine and I are committed to continue having that space open so we can advance together and solve these issues in good faith, always, as I said, on Monday morning, rooted in the public interest. This is our mission. This is what we should be doing. So thank you again for that.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much, Fadi.

Mike next.

MIKE SILBER: Alan, thank you. And thank you to the people who attended last night. And I think most importantly, thank you to the other members who are willing to allow a small group to engage. I think we often have a scenario in ICANN where the work of small groups is not trusted. And everybody has to be in the room in case your representatives do a secret deal you don't like. So that was greatly appreciated.

Alan, also thank you for your honesty that I think there was still a little bit too much talking at each other last night. It is understandable.

But, again, in acknowledging it, we at least are not accusing others that they're not understanding our position or they're not willing to compromise. And I think it's a very good way to avoid a lot of the finger pointing into the future.

Two things that I'd ask the ALAC to consider as they formulate and consider the outcomes of last night as they consider the way forward, is I think there are two absolutely vital principles that we need to look at

over here. The first is rationality. What is the problem that we're trying to address and is the mechanism that is being proposed actually likely to address it?

And then the second is proportionality. Is the response being expected and the costs to be incurred proportional to the risk involved and the harm of danger.

And I think one of the issues that came up last night is that there was a lot of criticism from your colleague to your left that facts that were provided were merely anecdotal, but there's no basis for a lot of the fear that's being -- or concern that's being raised. And there also has been a lack of clarity and specificity in terms of what actually are the risks. And Fadi started touching into that, and I would really appreciate work by ALAC in terms of what are the real risks. Not what is pure conjecture but what are the real risks. Because if we get those down, then we can look at what is rational and proportional responses to that. And I think you're in a better position than almost anybody else. You can go to experts. But you're in a position to actually engage with users in your communities. But really try and get them as specific as possible. And I'd like to suggest maybe a good place to start in terms of the experts is Architelos has put out their state of abuse report for 2014 which engages in the issue of abuse which is 99% spam in existing TLDs versus new TLDs. And it might be worthwhile engaging with research like that but then slicing and dicing it into what are we actually concerned about here.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Mike. I'd like to request that we try not to talk about the subject itself here. This meeting would go on for many hours at this point to try to fix the problem, but I'd like to try to focus to the extent possible on not the subject matter but the -- the effectiveness of the meeting and, you know, how do we go forward from here. Thank you. George next.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks, Alan. Let's see, four of you have spoken to this, Mike, Fadi, you, and Cherine, and I think by and large I would agree with the comments that have been made. The take-away I took from that hasn't been mentioned yet is that if this meeting had happened two months before, then it would have been a different meeting, a better meeting, we would have had a chance to talk about an overarching framework in which the problem existed, et cetera, and I'd like to point out I think -- I think this community is not very good at early identification of problems. And I know it's difficult because we have all kinds of problems and disputes and we don't know which ones are going to be -- are going to elevate themselves to major issues, but I think we ought to take more into account the issues that we have now that are likely to go and nip them in the bud to talk about them to have these meetings. I think you made a very good observation that the fact that the meeting even occurred at all was very promising. Let's see if we can identify issues that may cause us problems and have these meetings earlier and try to resolve issues earlier. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, George. I ask people to have short interventions. We are already at the stage now where we should be going on to item 4, ignoring the item that Steve wanted to add to the agenda. So let's keep it quick. I have a speaker list right now of Evan, myself, Olivier, Cherine again, and then we'll close.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks, Alan. On Cherine's point about trusting small groups. I think -- sorry, somebody, I forget who it was, made the issue of trusting small groups. Mike. But Cherine's first comment at the beginning of the meeting was this is not a decision-making thing. You're all going to have to go back to your own groups, and I think that's one thing that helped put things at ease and may have helped that issue of trust. When you know there's not going to be like this little secret thing where things are being decided, I think that was one of the first things that was needed to do trust.

But in terms of the nature of the meeting, I think it's interesting and important to bring out the fact that one of the things that was brought out at the beginning is that you had a certain number of constituencies that said, there is no problem and a number of other constituencies and groups that said yes, there is a problem. So the fact that the meeting happened, the fact that it was even necessary to say this is not there's differences of opinion. This was, you have a bunch of people saying there is a problem and the others saying there is no problem and trying to come up with some other things. And so Fadi, I'll bring this back to you. The issue that came before. What is the best way to sound an alarm bell and saying, this is important to us, that doesn't require the

ICANN | 52
Singapore

desperation act of something like calling for a freeze at a public meeting? How do we put something on and say look, you may not want to recognize there's an issue. Let's at least identify it, make sure everyone's aware of it, and not have to go through that kind of drastic measure? We're still on (indiscernible).

ALAN GREENBERG: Evan, we'll use the same alarm bell that we do to stop people from talking too much. Fadi, quick response?

FADI CHEHADE: The quick answer is, the very productive meetings we now have with Alan and all the SO/AC leaders. I'm going to add to that meeting, which I have with them once a month, I'm going to add now an actual section called alarm bells. No, really. I'm going to ask each leader from each community to tell me at this monthly meeting, look, I'm -- canary in the coal mine. This is an issue that's coming. And so we'll track these and we'll try and nip them in the bud early. Because George is right. What we did last night is a couple of months too late. Fine. You know, now the oxygen -- that's why one of the reasons I want this transition to end is frankly so we have oxygen to do more of this, so we can really be working instead of just simply arguing about something that will happen anyways, just a matter of when. But anyway, I agree with you, and I will add it to my monthly meeting.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Fadi. I participated leadership -- the pre-ICANN leadership training at the last meeting, and one of the things that they taught,

which some of us know already, when you hear someone saying something, repeat it back to them and say is this what you meant? If there had been more of that last night, we would have been way far ahead because there were clearly on both sides some misinterpretation of what was being said. And it impacted severely the ability to move forward. So that's an interesting lesson on that. Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Alan. Olivier speaking. I was going to drill into the actual topics that we had discussed last night, and I had actually anticipated Mike's suggestion of doing some research in the spare time between last night and this morning, which I have done. And I was going to show some substantiated evidence.

ALAN GREENBERG: But you're not.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Unfortunately eve been cut down by my chair, so not being able to do that, there was one part of the meeting which I was confused about which was the action items that were taken from that meeting. I heard a set of action items and I wasn't sure whether these were agreed or not, and I wonder whether Cherine could let us know. I know one of them is to meet again in the future, maybe in three weeks. But if we meet again in three weeks without any other action items, then we might risk doing the same thing as last night. I think it was very productive to be able to speak, but I'd be very happy to hear the actual action items so we could work on them. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you, Olivier. And I'll turn the floor over to Cherine in a moment, but I'll give you my closing argument, that is to ask Cherine if we could follow up with what the action items are and what the next steps are out of the meeting. So that was my closing statement. Now I'll turn it over to Cherine to make the second to last statement.

CHERINE CHALABY: Thank you. I have to remember what we said last night, but I wrote it down, thank God. The idea was, it would be I think not very beneficial just to meet again and repeat what we said last night in the same style. So if we meet again, we need some more things on the table so that we can take our thoughts forward.

The discussion revolved last night around four or five items that we need to bring back to the table, four ideas or so. The first thing was, for everybody that was not in the meeting, the discussion was around the group of strings that are classified as highly -- highly sensitive, highly regulated. And there's about 39 of those. So the first idea was, are the concerns that everybody has around a total 39 or there could be a triage and let's bring it down to some realistic number that we can then deal with because that could be very helpful. So the first thing is we're going to circulate those strings, categorize them between sort of financial health, and then the parties that have a concern can express which one they really want to focus on. So that's the first idea.

The second idea that came about -- and these are just ideas. They're not decisions. They're not -- they may not materialize into anything, but

at least they will stimulate the discussion. The second idea was around okay now that you have made the triage, can we create a database of disclosed information that will help the cementing of -- of a TLD? And people refer to that as a trust mark, okay? So that any registrant that can access the database and then look at it and see which -- which TLDs have certified or not certified, whatever. Let's not get into the details. But that was the second idea.

The third idea was around the -- and Mike mentioned the idea of rationality and proportionality in relation to that discussion as well.

Then we talked about the PIC DRP and those are an idea around the fast tracking. Because the concern here was that governments and Consumer Protection Agencies may not have access to the PDRP -- the PIC PDR process, so if they submit a complaint or a concern or something will ICANN compliance react to it in a fast manner, in a responsive manner, and could it be fast tracked. So this is another idea that would be brought to the table.

The next idea was a -- and that came from Fadi, and I think Akram wasn't happy because it put a lot of work -- workload on him. It was about the compliance proactive monitoring. So the point here was that it is also important to do some monitoring and could we beef up the compliance function and to do some proactive monitoring rather than just reactive one.

There was also the -- the registries and the registrars and everybody agreed that let's talk about facts rather than just anecdotal evidence about issues of breach and trust and so on and so forth in these domains. So every -- I don't know how but we need to think about it,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

people are going to provide some facts based on their experience. Because the registries and the registrars who had these domain -- some of them, the sensitive running for six months, they reported last night that they had not experienced any problems. But then Olivier came back and said, I have a Web site here, I have all of these details. So people want to provide facts so that we all sit down and look at facts. Because maybe you want to look at something longer than six months, two years to really have a view of what's going on. I wonder if I've missed anything else. Oh, the other thing was a question are the PICs inside the picket fence or not, and can a PDP sort of work and change these PICs? So we didn't have an answer last night. We need to think about that and come to it. Have I missed anything else? I don't know if I have.

ALAN GREENBERG: I was actually asking that something be sent out afterwards, not -- not forcing you to do it right now. But I -- I think that covers -- I believe that covers most of them.

CHERINE CHALABY: We will write a memo so that it's on paper and staff will prepare a talking point for the next meeting around all of these issues so that we have something to discuss. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Fadi says I should mention the letter I asked, but I honestly can't remember what that is. So please tell me what I asked for.

FADI CHEHADE: Maybe I should just take benefit from that. Forget it.

ALAN GREENBERG: We'll talk later.

FADI CHEHADE: No, it's important. That you asked us for that and Allen committed to
                       do it. So Allen -- you remember.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, now I remember the letter. This goes back to the beginning of the
                       meeting. One of the issues we had was -- Cherine alluded to it -- that
                       what is now being called fast track, we simply wanted to make sure that
                       should sometime in the future Contractual Compliance become
                       completely inundated, we're receiving thousands of complaints about
                       something or other, that if PIC-type complaints came in from consumer
                       agencies, regulators, governments that they be put somewhere near
                       the top of the list and acted on quickly, even if more mundane requests
                       from individuals perhaps cannot be responded in that time frame.

FADI CHEHADE: Correct. Alan, and the letter will clarify without doubt, because some
                       people asked this, that anyone can actually submit a compliance -- a
                       complaint to compliance on the PICs because there was some confusion
                       as to will we accept anyone to call compliance and say we have an issue
                       with how a registry or registrar is implementing a PIC. The answer is

ICANN | 52
Singapore

yes. And Alan asked us to produce a letter confirming that, that anyone can do that and not just the affected parties or the -- the people in the contract.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. For clarity, we've asked that question a number of times over the last year and a half and each time gotten a completely different answer. So hopefully we'll have clarity this time around in writing. Thank you very much. We have -- sorry?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. It's Evan. The issue of the letter, it wasn't from you, it was from the other Allen.

ALAN GREENBERG: Yeah. No, I understand. Okay, we -- excuse me, can we -- can I try to take control back on this meeting. We have five minutes left. We have one item on the agenda and that is a report on the -- selected report on a number of recommendations on the At-Large summit. Sorry. Olivier, I'm trying to get to it if I can just finish a little bit. There is nothing in the ATLAS report that is asking for immediately either response for the Board or action for the Board so we'll do that electronically, and I'll turn it over to Steve to raise his issue. Thank you.

STEVE CROCKER: Thank you. Just to comment on the ATLAS II, my recollection is that you guys had a great report coming out of the June meeting in London, it was, and we're waiting for the next level of detail, is that right?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, we've revamped the list and tried to be more specific about things that we want to tell the Board about because we think it has merit to alert the Board and things that are actually asking for Board action.

STEVE CROCKER: Good.

ALAN GREENBERG: And these were mainly an update on things that we believe you should be aware of.

STEVE CROCKER: Excellent.

ALAN GREENBERG: And they don't have to be done today, despite the amount of time that was spent on them.

STEVE CROCKER: No, I realize. I just wanted to say, our attention remains, and we're eager to see this. So it's -- we haven't forgotten about it. The additional item not on the agenda there that came up tangentially here, here we are in Singapore. We move our meetings around from place to place, and one of the specific intentions of moving around is to bring in local community more and more. So the question is, how well is that working? How much of the local community here has been engaged,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

and in general what's your sense of how well this process actually works as opposed to if we all met in the same location every time?

ALAN GREENBERG: Cheryl and then Holly.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Thank you. Cheryl Langdon-Orr, for the record. It's going to be an it depends. When we're not drowning but we are actually waving, and at this meeting we're drowning because of all of the other work that's going on, so in terms of the ability for our community to prepare and effectively make the outreach and ensure the engagement, as Fadi said the oxygen is out of the room. And so this wasn't able to be done where normally it probably would be and could be. You'll notice there's not the Town Hall meetings and all those other sorts of things simply because the other huge efforts are going on. So my response would -- knee-jerk reaction is, it depends. And it depends on how busy everyone is.

ALAN GREENBERG: Holly.

HOLLY RAICHE: I just echo it, there's no time, and particularly with the revised meeting strategy. It would have to happen with the seven days and actually where you have -- you have time to prepare and then time to actually set up something so that you've actually attracted people, you find something that the issues that in fact they can get their heads around

and have them -- a reason for them to come. And you have to have a reason -- we actually have the time for the rest of us to be able to interact at the moment, that's just -- it hasn't been possible.

STEVE CROCKER: So just to be clear, how much of the issue is preparation time and how much of it is the density of the meeting time that we have?

HOLLY RAICHE: I actually think it's both. I think you do have to prepare, otherwise people are going to wonder why they're there. But there's also the time that all of us have been taken up doing just so many other things. I don't think any of us have had time to make those kind of preparations.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. Thank you, Holly. We're now officially over time. I've been told the Board has another meeting in 15 minutes. We'll go -- we'll go for a few minutes. We have Sebastien and we have someone over there who I didn't see whose hand it is. Sebastien.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yeah. First of all, Steve, it's a little bit strange question as the Board just vote for a new meeting strategy and all that is embedded in the way ICANN will need to set up and organize a meeting in the future. And my second point, it's not too many people from Morocco unfortunately but we were prepared to go there. And the question for the people here, it's quite difficult because it was short noticed. Thank you.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBONERO: Thanks, Alan. This is Fatima Cambonero, ALAC member for the record. I will speak in Spanish because we have interpretation.

As regards the question made by Steve about the involvement of local communities as the meetings take place in different regions, I think it's important to take into account the role played by local ALSs. And for local ALSs to be able to work with the community, it's necessary to have a feedback cycle. ICANN should provide training to ALSs so that eventually those ALSs can go back to their communities and train their own communities and achieve their involvement and participation. In many cases, in many RALOs that training isn't charged on the RALOs themselves. In other cases it doesn't exist, and many times we did not only training but also funding for those ALSs to be able to go out to the community and take ICANN's voice. When we attended the Buenos Aires meeting we went to a university with Fadi and many people who participated in that meeting, people from the university, eventually got involved in ICANN's activities. That is progress as compared to what's happening in other regions. I think we should take this into account, this dual feedback cycle with the webinars and trainings and then we should have the ALSs to -- we should help them to go back to their own communities. Thank you very much.

STEVE CROCKER: I like that a lot. Bueno.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

ALAN GREENBERG: I think one of the things that -- one of the comments worth making though is when we meet in any given place, if we had met in Marrakech I don't know if we have any ALSs in Marrakech. I don't think so. It's not clear that we would be able to interact with our local community in any given city. At most -- in most places we will likely have one or maybe two ALSs in that particular location. When we are funded for General Assembly in a region, that changes the -- the perspective completely. That requires significant funds of course, and we can only do that a limited number of times but -- at least under the current budgeting processes, but that does change it completely. When we can bring in all the people in from Africa, for instance, in a meeting, for instance, for a meeting in Africa or Latin America, that becomes a really different situation and something that's very, very productive. We have a number of speakers who want to speak. We have Tijani and then Wolfgang.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Thank you, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: And a hand in the back that I can't see, and we have two minutes before we must break.

TIJANI BEN JAMAA: Yes. For Marrakech there is a lot of activities planned, and one of them is the engagement of the local community. So we have a program for

the new generation and also we have a program for engaging with the local At-Large community and not only At-Large, the local ICANN community. So this was a question.

ALAN GREENBERG: Wolfgang.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: To avoid reinventing the wheel and duplication, my strong recommendation is that the ALAC coordinates with the noncommercial stakeholder group. They have the same discussion. They plan to organize at each ICANN meeting a special workshop or symposium with the local community in coordination with the local university and it would be perfect and feed into the cross constituency collaboration if you would do it together.

CHARLES OLOO: I thank you very much. I'm Charles Oloo. I'm from Kenya. Thank you for the presentations. I would like to bring up the same issue. I've been holding the remote hubs for ICANN for the last two years in Kenya in universities. And one thing that came up was that most of the students don't understand anything about Internet governance, so they got interested very much and they started to learn about Internet governance. Something that came up very clearly was that most of the students that came up from the universities have a lot of skills and abilities to start their own businesses but they don't have the -- the skills and the atmosphere to do work because of policies in the government that would allow local government -- local companies to work with -- to

ICANN | 52
Singapore

do outsourcing in -- outside the country. Like Europe, for example. Like other -- other developed work because of the policies that are in your country.

So what can ICANN do to help the governments to fast-track the country policies to be (indiscernible) with other countries like OECD so that the other countries also can be able to (indiscernible) outsourcing and help develop business in the African context and also build capacity within the African context. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I don't think we really have time to address the issue now, but I think it's noted. I would like to say that I think we've demonstrated, despite the way we went into the first topic today, that we can take these meetings in this format and make them productive, useful, and satisfying. So thank you everyone. Steve, do you have any closing comments?

STEVE CROCKER: Yes. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]